

---

Subject: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 00:35:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I was going through some old notes and found a reply I gave someone who asked me about the KJV. Why do I use it. Why did Bro. Freeman recommend it. Isn't there errors in it etc. I found it quite interesting to read over my reply. Its probably old news for us here but I thought the author spoke quite elegantly so I thought I would post it.

This is a basic (very basic) overview of how we got the KJV and why I believe it is the best available today.

There are 4 different types of manuscripts we get our modern Bibles from.

- 1/ The Alexandrian
- 2/ The Byzantine
- 3/ The Caesarian
- 4/ The Western

The Alexandrian manuscripts gave us among others 2 very well known ancient manuscripts called Sinaiticus ( found in the Sinai peninsula at St. Catherines Monestary) & Vaticanus ( found in the Vatican)

There are two modern well known Greek translations based on the Alexandrian manuscripts that are called the United Bible Society Text ( UBS ) and the Nestle-Aland Text ( NA ) Almost all modern translations of the Bible are based on these two texts.

The Byzantine manuscripts have given us two well known Greek Texts. The Textus Receptus (received text or TR.) and the Majority Text. The Greek scholars that produced the Majority Text produced it by saying if a majority of manuscripts translated a passage a certain way then that is the way they chose.

The Textus Receptus is the basis for our modern KJV.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 00:41:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Before I go any further I'd like to give a little background on a related area. There is large group of (mostly) non charismatic Christians who are engaged today in warfare with the rest of Christendom over the KJV. These people believe the KJV is inspired and the other modern versions of the Bible are polluted and demonic for e.g.. NIV NASV RSV etc. I strongly disagree with this position.

A good example of this is found in G Riplingers "New Age Bible Versions" I don't recommend anyone read it. The basic position of these people is that God inspired the KJV and that where it differs with Greek text the proper thing to do is throw out the Greek text.

Some of these people engage in vitriolic personal attacks on everyone who disagrees with their position.. Their work is also very unscholarly Peter Ruckman (Pensacola Bible Institute) William Grandy Texe Marrs Gail Riplinger and Chick Publications are a few eggs of this position. They don't say this but I would sum up their position by repeating the old joke " if the KJV was good enough for Apostle Paul it is good enough for me "

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 00:49:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

We teach that the Bible is inspired as spoken and written down by the original apostles in the original languages. This is also the basic position of almost all conservative scholars. What we have today in all our Bibles are translations of Gods inspired word.  
That doesn't mean we can't use them or trust them it just means that the inspiration of the Bible came with the original.

There is a related doctrine called Preservation . This we believe is God's action not in inspiring the Bible but in preserving it down through the centuries. The King James Only people believe that God preserved the text of the Bible by preserving the KJV. They believe that God supernaturally inspired and preserved the KJV and/or the TR. manuscript it was based on. We have a different view.

I would like to loosely quote James R White from his book "The King James Only Controversy"

"God protected that text (the original) from the one thing that we could never detect: the wholesale change of doctrine or theology by one particular man or group who had full control over the text at any one point in its history. As the books of the Bible were written down in NT times they were very rapidly sent all over the known world so nobody at any point had total control over them. So they couldn't change the words to suit their particular doctrine. Rome and the pope for e.g.. In fact there

were very ancient manuscripts that were found in relatively recent times buried in the sands of Egypt. Dating back to about 200 AD These manuscripts are almost identical to the byzantine manuscripts written almost a 1000 years later. God preserved the Bible by making sure it was spread all over the world and nobody had full control over it."

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 00:54:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That brings us to modern translations. The basic KJV was translated around 1600 AD by a group of Anglican scholars from the original Greek and Heb. with a lot of comparison to some earlier versions. It was based on the Textus Receptus / Byzantine manuscripts. The modern translations NIV, NASV etc. are all of this centuries vintage or have been revised in this century and are all without exception as far as I am aware based on the Alexandrian manuscripts. Lots to say about that let me sum it up by saying there is nothing wrong with using either set of manuscripts. My problem is with the translators.

On the related question of " isn't there errors in the KJV". All the Bibles we have are translations. Or to put it differently they are some mans or group of mens opinion of what the Greek/ Heb. says. Even the KJV. All the bibles did well in some areas and poorly in others. That's why we have Greek and Heb. lexicons and that's why ministers have to know how to use them. In my opinion there are no more or less errors in the KJV than in any other version. As far as I am aware nobody in the faith camp would claim the KJV to be inspired. Most of us use it because Bro. Freeman recommended it. Some of our teachers use the New King James Version (a totally new version ) I personally think the KJV is the best version we have today for use as a Bible.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 01:00:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My reasons for using the KJV and believing it to be the best version available:

1/ Bro. Freeman recommended it. He was a scholar - taught Hebrew & OT in a conservative seminary - and spent his life in deep serious study. If he said it he had good reasons for saying it. I have confidence in him.

2/ Bro. Freeman recommended it. I trust him spiritually. Every student in a university has a professor and for all practical purposes he was mine. I don't agree with everything he said but I trust him spiritually. If he said it then its good enough for me.

3/ The KJV was written at a time when the word of God was still accepted as the word of God. At the time it was written not everyone was saved but there was society wide acceptance that this was Gods word. There was no serious criticism of it and there were no scholars who seriously debated its accuracy. It was just accepted society wide as Gods word.

What you believed personally for you was irrelevant it was accepted by all as Gods word. There has been for the last several 100's of yrs. or so a barrage of criticism against the Bible. Originating in Germany and from there all over the world there came a tremendous attack on the truthfulness of the Bible.

They have attacked the text the history the archeology the spiritual truth. The liberal scholars have left no stone unturned in looking for ways to undermine the Bible as Gods word.

Lots I could say about this. Let me sum it up by saying that in my opinion there is not a seminary (conservative or liberal) university or denomination (including the charismatic ones) that have been left unscarred by this. The point here as far as Bible translations are concerned is that the people who translated the modern Bibles are all Liberals or conservatives that have been affected by the liberal attack. Because they go to seminaries where liberal professors teach. A lot of them of course would vehemently disagree with I said but that is my opinion.

Today in almost any university in almost any discipline to openly declare yourself a conservative Christian is to declare intellectual and professional suicide. The point is that this is the culture that is producing the modern Bibles. Maybe I am being a little unfair in tarring everyone with the same brush but my point is not to point to an individual but to show where the culture that translates the Bibles is at.

4/ A good solid fear of the Lord is really lacking today. The prevailing opinion today is that the fear of the Lord is a reverential awe. In my opinion that is absolute bunk. It is very unscholarly too and it certainly can't be supported from the biblical text. Solomon said it was the beginning of wisdom. Paul talked about the terror of the Lord. In my opinion being a translator is thankless task. It doesn't matter what you do someone will criticize you for it. Having said that if you are going to do it you better have a fear of God You had better have a very strong sense of looking for the praise of God and not from man because anybody that picks up that job is going to have something said to him on the day of judgment and the thing is it doesn't have to be bad if you start with the fear of the lord.

The point here is the modern translators don't seem to have it

5/ I read an article in Christianity Today recently on the subject of the modern Hebrew rabbis who are writing books on the bible The man who wrote the article said that the rabbis who are writing books about the Bible believe the KJV is the closest to the original Heb. That is really summing up what he said a little too simplistically. but it more or less states his position.

6/ Another reason I believe the KJV is the best and I'm not going to explain too much here because it is too difficult is because of the tremendous attacks on it. The devil just doesn't like it.

7/ Here's my final reason and perhaps for me personally the best. I just like it. I'm used to using it I like the way it phrases things.

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 01:18:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Good stuff, Mark.

Interesting that you mention Chick Publications (the Chick Tract people!). Two or three years ago I ran across some of David Daniel's youtube videos (he has a bunch out there) and I think I went through all of them. There's probably over a hundred of them and they all are about ten minutes in duration.

Anyway, after each and every video I kept thinking, "hey, I don't disagree with him on anything he's said". Now keep in mind, I don't find myself agreeing on every point with anyone (not even myself!!). This was unprecedented in my life.

So, for whatever it's worth, I'd recommend his videos on this topic. This has been one of the most fascinating subjects in my christian walk and to find a brother, with which I couldn't find disagreement, not even once... well, to say the least, I was stunned!

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 07 Feb 2020 01:39:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Here is the link for their site:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCJq7K6lZrYkFCLhpeLiOy7A>

I'm not asking for you or anyone else to dedicate as much time as it would take to go through all of the videos on the subject but I would be tremendously blessed if any of you can find one video where you would disagree with his position and share it with me. This is such an unusual phenomena in my life (finding nothing to disagree with!) that it has literally got me bumfuzzled... it is surreal to me.

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [james](#) on Sat, 08 Feb 2020 14:55:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have always wondered about the argument modern translators make concerning what the Dead Sea Scrolls contained. They say that, for example Mark 16: 9-20 is left off in the ancient manuscripts found near the Dead Sea, so the ESV (maybe others, I don't know) doesn't contain these verses. I haven't had the opportunity to read the Dead Sea Scrolls, so I don't know for a fact. But that always bothers me when someone is reading or teaching in that chapter and just stops with verse 8. Maybe it's the speaking in tongues or casting out demons, or handling of the snakes that has some influence on these translators...or maybe it's not in the scrolls.

Also in KJV the II Corinthians 5:21 verse always bothers me when it's translated to say Jesus was made sin for us....I believe saying a "sin offering" would be more accurate. Everyone knows Jesus never sinned, but some say at the moment on the cross He did bear the sins of the world in His body. I think that teaching is in error, the OT sacrifices were pointing to what God had planned for our redemption would be, the sacrifice of Jesus as our substitute. The bulls, lambs, and goats weren't guilty of Israel's sins and trespasses, they were the sacrifice that appeased God's wrath against sin. Jesus was just that, the perfect sacrifice, sinless and pure...again the idea that a sinner could be an acceptable sacrifice before God doesn't hold water; we wouldn't need Jesus if that were true, we're all sinners and we could die for ourselves if that were the case...It is not, so just sound reasoning would lead one to understand this...but...everyone doesn't read the Word of God in totality, because we know that partial understanding and an unwillingness to study and search out truth will lead to wrong conclusions.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Sun, 09 Feb 2020 22:36:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mark L wrote on Fri, 07 February 2020 00:41 Before I go any further I'd like to give a little background on a related area. There is large group of (mostly) non charismatic Christians who are engaged today in warfare with the rest of Christendom over the KJV. These people believe the KJV is inspired and the other modern versions of the Bible are polluted and demonic for e.g.. NIV NASV RSV etc. I strongly disagree with this position.

A good example of this is found in G Riplingers "New Age Bible Versions" I don't recommend anyone read it. The basic position of these people is that God inspired the KJV and that where it differs with Greek text the proper thing to do is throw out the Greek text.

Some of these people engage in vitriolic personal attacks on everyone who disagrees with their

position.. Their work is also very unscholarly Peter Ruckman (Pensacola Bible Institute) William Grandy Texe Marrs Gail Riplinger and Chick Publications are a few eggs of this position. They don't say this but I would sum up their position by repeating the old joke " if the KJV was good enough for Apostle Paul it is good enough for me "

I think your last sentence fairly sums it up!

But, think about this:

Throughout the Bible God states that He preserves His Words.

If this is true (and I believe it is) where has He preserved His Word? NIV, CEV, etc., etc..

What version can we say is God's preserved word?

Do we need men to tell us what is or is not God's Word or has He preserved it somewhere in an unfragmented state that isn't dependent upon this or that scholar?

Keep in mind that "having faith" is very much dependent upon us having a preserved record of God's Word--[Rom 10:17 KJV] 17 So then faith [cometh] by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

How much "faith" can we have in God's Word if we don't know if this or that verse is a record of His Word?

How much faith can we have (based upon Rom 10:17 above) if what we have is cluttered with footnotes that continuously tell us that "this isn't in the best manuscripts"? Side-note: The 2 so-called 'best manuscripts' contradict each other repeatedly. (Astonishingly often!)

The Hebrew people have a preserved record of the OT. Their methodology, their chain of evidence, their meticulousness, God's watchfulness, assured a trustworthy transmission. That, coupled with the promise of God to preserve His words, gives us assurance that the translation into English is reliable.

The NT methodology, while different, also served to guarantee the reliability of the textual transmission. This, also coupled with the promise of God, assures us that, when the printing press was invented, we too could reliably trust that God was involved in preserving His Words.

Given God's interest in making sure His Words were accurately recorded and preserved (afterall, it is HIS revelation we're talking about here!), why can't we accept that He would like for us (the English speaking world) to accurately have a record of what He said?



Enter: the English Speaking World's Authorized Translation (KJV).

Now, the above requires faith, I'll not deny, but given what I know about God (from the KJV), concerning His own promise--[Psa 119:89 KJV] 89 LAMED. For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.--why wouldn't I believe that He would give us a version that was kept free from error for us here on earth?

Anyway, it certainly is a fascinating subject filled with thousand upon thousands of arguments.

PROPOSED CHALLENGE:

I think it might be helpful to cut to the chase--jumping over all of the thousands of arguments people have over the authenticity of this or that verse/word/passage and single out just one place in the KJV that is NOT the Word of God. I'm not talking about a place that someone thinks could be translated better, or thinks there should be more grk/heb support, I'm talking about a place that one can categorically say--THESE ARE NOT THE WORDS OF GOD.

Blessings,  
William

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 04:52:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hmmmm. Have to think about that one. Just off the top of my head a really poor eg would be the use of the word "unicorn" but have to give some thought to it.

Do you think the KJV is inspired?

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 05:29:15 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, I believe it is the text for the English people that God preserved for us.

I thought about (just for fun) to add a footnote to my challenge saying that it might be wise to start with (or spot) these two verses:



[Rev 22:18-19 KJV] 18 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19 And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and [from] the things which are written in this book.

<grin> Just to spice it up a bit!

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 05:32:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

'Unicorn', as we understand it today? or 'unicorn' in the 1600s?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 19:34:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well that is interesting. Since its you that is saying it I will have to give that some serious thought. I'm not trying to split hairs here but I do see a difference between preserve and inspire. Would you use the word "inspire"? As in inspired the KJV text?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 20:11:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

william wrote on Mon, 10 February 2020 05:32'Unicorn', as we understand it today? or 'unicorn' in the 1600s?

I don't understand a 'unicorn"... in the Bible, in 1600, or today. I've just always figured it was an animal that is now extinct, like the dinosaurs, or more recently the Dodo or Passenger Pigeon. Leviathan, Behemoth, and the Cockatrice...what are they? extinct animals or possible something still around that we call by another name, like hippopotamus or cobra/mamba. Obviously I'm not as deep a thinker as you guys; also I don't see any way to ever have those

answers that inquiring minds want to know.

I do believe that God both inspired and preserved His Word, and continues to do so. Paul said that ALL scripture is God breathed; was he inspired to write that? When John wrote that Jesus said these words..."For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." was he lying? Was what he said different from that and meant something different or some random translators just mistranslated it? I believe that God inspired both Paul and John along with every other writer that wrote the books that we call The Bible; and that He inspired/influenced/preserved those translators that translated into English the KJV. If we're predestined unto salvation by a God who loves us enough to set all these events into motion, saved through hearing the Word and believing the Word; then surely He predestined that same Word to be kept/preserved/guarded over in order for that very purpose to be accomplished.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 21:45:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mark L wrote on Mon, 10 February 2020 19:34 Well that is interesting. Since its you that is saying it I will have to give that some serious thought. I'm not trying to split hairs here but I do see a difference between preserve and inspire. Would you use the word "inspire"? As in inspired the KJV text?

Well, I'm not sure. If you mean by 'inspiration' God-breathed, then I'd need to think about it more too!

But here is the point Mark, we don't have a completely 'inspired' Bible if we accept the commonly proffered statement of faith: "...in the original autographs!" Where are the original autographs? They don't exist.

Then I turn the argument around and examine it from the standpoint of our own quest for a "pure 100% God-Breathed Bible". Does it exist, can WE find it? I mean, are we really at the mercy of men/scholars for this? If so, they don't seem to be able to bring much more to the table than confusion.

Now, switching our attention back from man, to God... I find it infinitely more comforting to know that He's in charge of both giving and preserving His word than a man ever could be!

Use "unicorn" as an example: you can trust that God wanted that in the text and be left scratching your head about it in the year 2020, or you put your faith in men to get it right (because, after all, there's no such thing as a unicorn!). Here are some of their choices:

Unicorn= wild ox, wild bull, Reem, buffalo, antelope. (I'm sure there are other suggestions out there but these are just a few quick finds.)

Now we have an additional problem, which version, which man is right, which one can we trust as being God's intention? We could wait and see if there are more manuscripts found to shed light on the issue (or since we are only talking 'translations' here we can wait for better ideas!)

I know you can see my point even if you don't agree with it. Call me lazy, or whatever else comes to mind, but I find it so much easier to just trust that--since God is the one who has something to reveal, and He's the one that wants me to know that revelation, and He's the one who expects me to have faith in that revelation, then I have to trust Him to give it to me straight (especially since I'm going to be judged by it!) and make sure I have a pure version... it's in His hands, not Westcott, Hort, men at UBS, Nestle, or any other of the myriads of inspired want-a-bees.

I guess the point of my little challenge is this: What, after 400 years of trying, has man produced that is better than the KJV? Where are all of these so called 'errors'? Is it really that hard to teach the new meaning of a few archaic words? (let/prevent, etc..)

Okay, so if there's nothing wrong with the kjv text, the next stop is to pick apart the manuscripts that were used... once you go down that path there is no agreement on anything (with the exception of maybe their hatred of the KJV!). One man (or group) puts stock in this manuscript and another that manuscript, pretty soon you'll have enough of these 'priests'(intermediaries between God and man) to give yourself a choice (which one is right?)

I hope you got some of that, I'm just rambling around, believing against a cold, (paraphrasing, of course, the good old KJV -- by His Stripes, I'm Healed!)

Blessings,  
William

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 21:53:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:If we're predestined unto salvation by a God who loves us enough to set all these events into motion, saved through hearing the Word and believing the Word; then surely He predestined that same Word to be kept/preserved/guarded over in order for that very purpose to be accomplished.

I don't know why I even try.

... and you claim not to be thinking on a very deep level... pssshaw!

I just want to be able to say--"I know that man!"

Blessings,  
William

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 10 Feb 2020 21:58:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

william wrote on Mon, 10 February 2020 21:53Quote:If we're predestined unto salvation by a God who loves us enough to set all these events into motion, saved through hearing the Word and believing the Word; then surely He predestined that same Word to be kept/preserved/guarded over in order for that very purpose to be accomplished.

I don't know why I even try.

... and you claim not to be thinking on a very deep level... pssshaw!

I just want to be able to say--"I know that man!"

Blessings,  
William

Stop it! You're gonna make me have to go buy larger AU caps, I feel it swelling already... :lol:

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 15 Feb 2020 03:30:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:But here is the point Mark, we don't have a completely 'inspired' Bible if we accept the commonly proffered statement of faith: "...in the original autographs!" Where are the original autographs? They don't exist.

Super busy right now, but this video explains this concept in greater detail.

Mindful, mind you, that I'm not a believer in letting other believers do the due diligence in defending or defining my faith... I am, however, willing to add my hearty "amen" to this brother's work here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=krAJ6LVeDMk&list=PLhmAbEGx-AnTmooAtTeOAnDueQsQ3PYVY&index=34>

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Wed, 19 Feb 2020 04:48:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I watched the video. My only issue with it was that he set the questions the parameters around them and then the answers. There is nothing wrong with that but I don't really have the time to give to look at this whole issue.

I read a book yrs ago Called "The King James Only Controversy" by James White. I dug it out and had a quick look. His basic point was to refute the "inspiration" of the KJV and to show modern translations were trustworthy. I didn't agree with him on a lot of what he said. Especially on modern translations. It did have a lot of information on the subject though and I thought quite interesting.

He gave a lot of info on mistranslations and awkward translations in the KJV in comparison to the modern translations. Its simply too much work to put it all in here. Plus I really don't have the time to have a close look at it and make up my own mind if he is right or wrong. Which is what the subject deserves.

One thought I had is the KJV is really for the English speaking world. That leaves out all the other languages. Luther for eg did a translation that is still widely used across Germany.

I gave my reason for using the KJV above. I like it I'm used to it I think it the best translation we have. I would mostly agree with you but would have difficulty with preserve or inspire.

Anyway here is a link to the book. Actually just looked at it and its been updated and revised. I

thought some of the reviews were interesting too.

<https://tinyurl.com/KJV-only>

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [james](#) on Wed, 19 Feb 2020 14:23:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mark L wrote on Wed, 19 February 2020 04:48 I would mostly agree with you but would have difficulty with preserve or inspire.

Mark,

I know this conversation is mostly between you and William but am I understanding this correctly, are you saying that you don't believe the Bible we have today, KJV, is the inspired Words of God or that He has preserved those words in order for us to believe and be saved? Surely not, what am I missing here?

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Thu, 20 Feb 2020 15:56:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm going to give this some thought James. I had no idea you guys were so strong on the KJV.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 20 Feb 2020 19:47:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mark L wrote on Thu, 20 February 2020 15:56 I'm going to give this some thought James. I had no idea you guys were so strong on the KJV.

Hi Mark,

I don't want to leave you with the wrong impression... I've always THOUGHT that the KJV was the best version, I liked it. However, after looking at the so-called manuscript evidence and how it has been dealt with by the scholars, I'm now at the point that I can say--I KNOW that the KJV is the best version! I'm at the point where I would probably be called an "onlyist" because I don't see anything better, period.

Obviously the above comments are only my own opinion!

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [james](#) on Thu, 20 Feb 2020 21:52:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I must be a KJV onlyist, cause that's the 'onlyist' one I have or ever had. Our former pastor (David Platt) used the ESV and everyone (I'd guess 99%) started using that translation. Now our pastor (Matt Mason) uses the CSB and I see people with that translation. I've just kept using what I've used all my life KJV, everything I quote or pray back to The Lord comes out of my heart and mouth in the KJV. I've never questioned if it's God's inspired word or not, I've always believed it to be.

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Gary](#) on Fri, 21 Feb 2020 15:38:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Greetings All,

I started out with the KJV, then switched to the NKJV. Most scripture I've memorized is the KJV. I love the thees and thous it always seemed reverent to the Lord. I like to study the NKJV.

Enjoyed the posts, I'm believing God for energy. Ran across a good Christian station, SiriusXM the "Messenger", you can download the app on your cell. All good music.

In Him,  
Gary



---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2022 09:43:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey, I just ran across another video done by a brother (I think he's a Baptist) that was amazing in that he dealt with things I had never even considered!

I've watched two or three that he's done and all of them were well worth my time.

The first one is probably the most relevant to this discussion but the second link was the first one I watched. Fantastic stuff!

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bRikxrqqj94>

Here's the other one:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_OsSIGY6xj8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_OsSIGY6xj8)

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 22 Apr 2022 20:49:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not ignoring you William just haven't had a lot of time lately. I'm going to have to give up being retired and go back to work so I have more time!

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [james](#) on Tue, 26 Apr 2022 15:45:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

that's funny Mark, I just begun my nine months of being 'retired' until next January.

There's never been a doubt in my mind as to if the KJV is inspired. Guess the doubts in some minds comes from an uninspired source.

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Thu, 15 Jun 2023 01:07:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I just found this video today (and it's seems to be the tip of an iceberg).

Anyway, I'm not a big fan of numbers in the Bible but after watching a couple of this guy's videos, I'm stunned. Since the topic is the KJV, I figured that this was the place to post it.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yS78mFJcvhQ>

It's one of many videos (I've watched 3 so far) but so far it is very interesting!

If any of you have time, give your thoughts.

Blessings,  
William

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [David Coleman](#) on Tue, 31 Oct 2023 00:54:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I am hopeful that this will help. In 2Pet 1:21 We see that Holy men spoke by the Holy Spirit. Just look at Jeremiah and Baruch. Jeremiah spoke and Baruch wrote it down. What was written was from God. That then was pure Hebrew. When Jeremiah was punished they threw his works on parchment in the fire. No problem God gave the same words to write again.

Dr. Freeman also taught God's word is not inspired. The word of God is expired-- breathed out of his mouth and man the writer is inspired. (inspiration).

In John 14:26 we have the Holy Spirit will lead and guide you to all truth. To blame God for man's errors is like saying, I will protect you from the antichrist. (meaning) God cannot stop men from writing new interpretations of the bible with the excuse ( it is to hard to understand.)

In our time there is much division over what the bible says or doesn't say. One thing you will notice is people worshipping God but not in Spirit and in truth. (not God's fault.) Here is a place to start. Just read the O.T. prophesies and how they are quoted again in the N.T. and you will see they are fulfilled completely. Some are yet to be fulfilled.

One example Zech. 9:9. with Matt. 21:5 This is one small thing that will show you that with prayer and the Holy Spirit you will be able to discern bible accuracy. I am so sorry for anyone who has to look beyond minor errors to see the truth.

One thing Dr. Freeman taught was a scriptural analysis for interpretations. Bill chops. bible as a whole -is saying. 2. interpretation--many times it does that itself.3. languages-proper understanding what was said.--4. any helpful literature, example Josephus. 5. context. 6. historical setting. 7. O.T. has no N.T. other than what is drawn from it. in the new. 8. practical application or purpose. 9. structure. basically not one scripture.

there is also the who, what when, where and why method. God is very wise and he planned that those who were interested in his word would do a little work instead of having something so valuable to toss around as if of no value.

God has promised riches greater than gold or rubies to be found in that awesome wonderful book. I speak by experience. You can take everything I have but leave the bible of mine when you go. God bless.

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [william](#) on Wed, 28 Feb 2024 18:32:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hey Mark,

I saw this information on "Unicorns" today. It's from facebook reels:

<https://www.facebook.com/reel/1457142641564358>

I think that, when we gain an understanding of the historical context of the KJV translators, some of their word choices (e.g. like hell for hades) clear up what we modern-day folks consider problems!

Blessings,  
William

---

---

Subject: Re: Is the King James Version Inspired?  
Posted by [Mark L](#) on Fri, 01 Mar 2024 03:30:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That was interesting William. I passed it on. I've always said when all the facts are known the bible will be shown to be correct.

---